

Today's Topics:

ARRL
Mac vs IBM
Meteor Scatter Beacons (2 msgs)
military call signs.....etc.
Modifiying radios for out of band operation
Scanning food service
Telephone Interference

Date: 7 Dec 89 23:31:42 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!jarthur!bridge2!3comvax!tymix!opus!
ngregory@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Nathan Gregory)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <3077@tymix.UUCP>

In article <7327@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>>... That being said, I agree with the views expressed. I don't care if
>>you like it or not, modification for out of band service (MARS and CAP
>>excepted) seems to be illegal. What gives hams the right to do this?

Phil Karn Replies

>I don't mind saying that I've modified several of my Icom radios to provide
>out-of-band coverage.

Rest of posting deleted..

Phil overlooked a few reasons I have found for my own mods.

- 1) Use of transverters. Oftentimes using a transverter for LEGAL frequencies is enhanced when the rig used as the IF can go outside the ham bands it nominally covers.
- 2) Use of a rig as a SIGNAL GENERATOR on the bench where the signal is not radiated but used to troubleshoot other equipment. e.g. my Yaesu 757 can generate a nice 10.7 MHz signal, illegal to radiate, but fine when used on the bench to troubleshoot a malfunctioning rig.
- 3) Adding new (WARC) bands to receivers manufactured before the new bands came along. Many radios did not have the WARC bands, yet were able to cover them without problems with a simple mod. I don't know about most hams, but I keep my rigs a long time, and band allocations are not permanent. I want to be able to shift when the laws change. The recent addition of the WARC bands is but one example. The volatile situation on 220 could yet result in new freqs outside the current (old) band. (probably not very likely tho...:^()

back to Phil

> Modifying

>an amateur transceiver to *enable* it to transmit out of band is perfectly

>legal as long as you don't *actually* transmit out of band.

Thank God that we don't yet live in the police state that many would
force upon us!

Nathan
WA40TJ/6

Date: Thu, 07 Dec 89 17:36:15 CST
From: Rick Troth - N5CEI <TROTH@ricevm1.rice.edu>
Subject: Mac vs IBM
Message-ID: <8912072341.AA15099@brazos.rice.edu>

[... excellent points from Mike deleted ...]

>As for user interface, and the growing amount of innovative software
>becoming available, there is no choice: get a Mac!

I cannot keep quiet on this. I'm no great lover of MS-DOS or of
its command interpreter, but there is a bad side to the "Wonderful Mac
Mac User Interface" that everyone ignores: it promotes the "Push Button
Mentality". This is bad.

The Mac's menus let you get up to speed really quick, but you
cannot get away from them. Sure, most applications give you keyboard
shortcuts, but they're not guaranteed and never cover everything.

The opposite extreme is the various command shells for UNIX.
New users have a real problem with things like case sensitivity and
terse command names. But an experienced UNIX user can (presuming they
have learned to type) whip out what needs to be done in a flash.
(and without dragging their arm across the desk)

The "right way" is a balance between the two. The only company
that has really gone all-out on marrying Xerox-looking windows (yes,
Xerox invented them, not Apple) and UNIX (the "programmer friendly"
OS) is NeXT. Sales of their cube have been less than exciting, but
the design is RIGHT: it has all the pretties, but built on a much more
sound foundation. (yeah ... you can get a NeXT to crash easy enough,
but that's not legitimately blamed on Mach) It's real live UNIX with
shells, pipes, standard I/O, unified file system; but all the apps
are menus and windows.

[sigh] But most of us cannot afford a "real computer" and must

settle for a Mac or PC or C64 or TRS-80 or Timex-Sinclair.

>p.s. These are my personal opinions!

Likewise.

Rick Troth <TROTH@RICEVM1.RICE.EDU> ----- Rice ONCS VM Systems Support

Date: 7 Dec 89 20:06:39 GMT
From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)
Subject: Meteor Scatter Beacons
Message-ID: <7389@cbnewsm.ATT.COM>

Jim Reisert, AD1C, commented on the use of distant TV stations as meteor scatter beacons. They also make great indicators of propagation conditions. With the lack of a national VHF/UHF/Microwave beacon system (such as is established in the UK) distant TV stations can be used to judge tropo propagation. I find that here in the N.NJ area, channel 12 (Wilmington, DL) is a great indicator of conditions on 144 MHz. UHF stations on Long Island make good propagation indicators for 432 MHz. It helps to have a reasonable TV antenna (mine is from RS) and a rotor. You need a fairly distant and weak signal (very snowy but discernable picture) to judge propagation conditions since once the signal rises above a certain level, no improvement in picture is seen as signal strength further increases. (FM threshold effect?).

Bob Atkins, KA1GT

Date: 8 Dec 89 02:16:34 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: Meteor Scatter Beacons
Message-ID: <5717@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <7389@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>no improvement in picture is seen as signal strength further increases.
>(FM threshold effect?).
>

Bob Atkins, KA1GT

I doubt it. In the US, TV pictures are AM.

In the rare case that original ideas are found here, I am responsible.
Internet: kjh@usc.edu

Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: 7 Dec 89 23:47:06 GMT
From: umigw!mthvax.cs.miami.edu!wb8foz@handies.ucar.edu (David Leshner)
Subject: military call signs.....etc.
Message-ID: <1247@umigw.MIAMI.EDU>

>If one of us can piece it together, certainly someone who did such work for a
> living (i.e. the KGB) could handle it.

Every CI lecture I have ever gotten (lots-alas) pointed out
that 95% of all collected INTEL comes from published sources.

--

A host is a host & from coast to coast...wb8foz@mthvax.cs.miami.edu
no one will talk to a host that's close.....(305) 255-RTFM
Unless the host (that isn't close).....pob 570-335
is busy, hung or dead.....33257-0335

Date: 8 Dec 89 02:14:02 GMT
From: oliveb!orc!mipos3!pcocd2!jmasters@apple.com (Justin Masters ~)
Subject: Modifiying radios for out of band operation
Message-ID: <1346@mipos3.intel.com>

In article <5694@cps3xx.UUCP> hendrick@frith.UUCP (Kenneth J. Hendrickson) writes:

+In article <1188@necis.UUCP> rbono@necis.UUCP (Rich Bono) writes:
+>I can see the headlines now, "Ham radio equipment is used to disrupt
+>police/fire/ambulance (choose one) communications and 5 lives were lost".
+>What will they do??? Of course they will create a new law that says that
+>broadband technologies and computer controlled PLL's cannot be used in
+>Amateur gear any longer because it is too easlily modified for use in
+>services where it does not belong.

+

+Rich:

+ This would be another example of inept and ignorant legislators
+gone awry. Unfortunately, all we seem to have is inept and ignorant
+legislators. All this would do is create another black market. Don't
+we have enough black markets (drugs, prostitutes, certain weapons)?
+Didn't we learn in the 20's that creating black markets is
+self-defeating?

+

+ On the other hand, (and this is the real point of this posting),
+this might be good for amateur radio. What if all hams had to build
+their own rigs? What if the fancy stuff wasn't available commercially?
+This might get a lot of the riff-raff off the bands. Sure, we would all
+be inconvenienced, but there might be some hidden advantages.

+

+ I think that all amateur radio operators should be able to build

+their own equipment. I can (and have) build my own transmitters,
+receivers, and antennas. If I can do it at 10 GHz, I surely can do it on
+450 MHz and below!

Gee, just think, in 10-20 years, the hobby of Ham radios (tx/rx) goes down the
drain, due to lack of supporters (the field was made too tough to enter for
enjoyment purposes only), therefore, allowing our inept legislators to allow
other companies to whittle away what little bandwidth you do have.

You already are losing numbers in this field. I hope to join in the next
year. I'm not afraid of having to build my own rig. I'll probably have to do
something like that in the first place (buying a home, going to college,
and raising a family tend to drain money from my wallet). Now, my home built
unit will probably not be as clean as many of you listeners might like, should
I transmit. Multiply my case by x and you can have a messy spectrum there,
with lots of signals washing out side bands. Not that I'll have some powerful
rig out there, but there are some who insist upon messing up other peoples
enjoyment, and they get a kick out of jamming frequencies with high power rigs
(they figure, "Oh, my wimpy little unit...I'll jack it up. Yeah! That's the
ticket. Then I'll be HEARD.").

Yeah, with tightened rules out there, it would just be a matter of years
before companies could squeeze you for your bandwidth.

Face it, there will always be a few who will mess things up for the rest of
us. If that becomes a problem, then maybe we should help to clean up the
mess. When lives are lost, you can bet the FCC will listen.

+
+>I sometimes wonder where this urge to modify radios to transmit in an area
+>that we are not allowed comes from.

+
+Most of it comes from wanting to use the receiver over a wider frequency
+range. Opening up the receiver on many UHF radios opens up the
+transmitter also. Why don't the rice-boxes come with extended receive
+capability on UHF?

"Rice-boxes"? Oh, now that's a cute little discriminatory statement. Now
here's someone we can elect into a legislator position to lobby for an
increase in tariffs and lowering of units allowed into the U.S. from the far
east.

+
+In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
+are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
+Internet: kjh@pollux.usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!pollux!kjh

Is my car the only one in America where | Justin "Ice Cream Monster" Masters
someone breaks in and turns up my radio |
every time I park? - Steven Wright | jmasters@fmdgr1.intel.com

Date: 8 Dec 89 01:01:41 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!usc!merlin.usc.edu!girtab.usc.edu!
eickmeyer@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Biff Henderson)
Subject: Scanning food service
Message-ID: <6928@merlin.usc.edu>

In article <8912010815.AA04489@uchvax.Berkeley.EDU> MROWEN@STLAWU.BITNET ("Mike Owen, W9IP") writes:

>Regarding the earlier, exhaustive posting regarding
>food service frequencies:
>
> For crying out loud, WHO CARES?

You can mystify the heck out of the "food service" "workers" by placing your order before your car reaches their speaker where you normally place your order. For even faster service, you can place your order before you leave home! Big yuks all around as they take your order while their closed-circuit TV monitor shows no cars in the drive through!

: -)
(it's just a joke!)

Date: 8 Dec 89 01:48:08 GMT
From: ems@apple.com (Mike Smith)
Subject: Telephone Interference
Message-ID: <5681@internal.Apple.COM>

In article <12600006@hpmwtmlb.HP.COM> timb@hpmwtd.HP.COM (Tim Bagwell) writes:
>I also have this problem on my phone (a Panasonic) and a neighbors phone. The
>RFI seems to be worse on 15 and 20 meters. I agree with Al that the main source
>of pick-up is through the handset cord.

>Please post, on the net, any results that you find to work.

I would expect a ferrite bead at one or both ends of the cord to suppress the RF from getting out of the wire and into the electronics... if the wire has a modular plug it should be easy to thread it through a bead and glue the bead to the {handset, phone body} if it works...

--

E. Michael Smith ems@apple.COM

'Whatever you can do, or dream you can, begin it. Boldness has
genius, power and magic in it.' - Goethe

I am not responsible nor is anyone else. Everything is disclaimed.

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #989
